

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

In the office action dated Sept. 30, 2008, claims 1-3, 5, 10-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady U.S. Patent No. 7,114,171 in view of Loui U.S. Patent No. 6,813,618 and (impliedly) Monagahn U.S. Patent No. 7,321,383. Claims 4, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady in view of Loui and (expressly) Monagahn. The '103 rejections are respectfully traversed.

Section 3 of the office action uses Monagahn to bolster" the reasons for the '103 rejection of base claims 1 and 18. However, such bolstering would imply that Monagahn is being used in combination with Brady and Loui. That is, Monagahn is being used as a secondary reference in a '103 rejection. Section 7 of the office action uses Monagahn expressly in the '103 rejection of claims 4, 19 and 20. However, 35 USC §103(c)(1) precludes Monaghan from being used in a '103 rejection. Monaghan is a '102(e) reference, and it is assigned to The Boeing Company, which is also the assignee of the present application. For this reason alone, the '103 rejection of the claims should be withdrawn.

The other two cited documents do not produce a vehicle having all of the features of base claim 1 or an aircraft having all of the features of base claim 18. Loui is cited solely as evidence that notebooks can be programmed with image editing software.

Brady discloses an In-Flight Entertainment (IFE) system including a line replaceable unit (LRU) 100 mounted in close proximity to a seat 750 and connected

between a user interface 200 and a network 1500 (see Fig. 1a). The LRU 100 provides audio to a passenger. The LRU 100 may also provide video to an optional display 600.

According to Brady, the LRU 100 “is, in an embodiment, a seat electronics box 2160” (col. 8, lines 57-59). A description of the seat electronics box 2160 starts at col. 15, line 18. The seat electronics box 2160 allows a passenger to connect a laptop computer into the network. However, Brady does not elaborate on the purpose of connecting a passenger’s laptop computer to the network 1500. A passage at col. 3, lines 60+ states that a laptop can serve as a user interface to an LRU, but it is not referring to a passenger’s laptop. Rather, the “embodiment is particularly advantageous for purposes of development, testing, and maintenance of an IFE system.”

Regardless, Brady does not teach or suggest an IFE system that allows passengers to perform image editing.

The office action doesn’t provide evidence or explain how a person skilled in the art would be led from Brady’s system to the vehicle seat having all of the features recited in claim 1.

Base claim 1 recites a vehicle seat for supporting a passenger. The seat includes a frame, a video monitor mounted on the seat frame, and a digital processor operatively connected to the video monitor for processing a digital input for display as an image on the video monitor. The digital processor is programmed with image editing software for allowing a passenger to organize and edit any one or more images from the digital input.

The vehicle seat of claim 1 is not limited to any particular type of vehicle. As but one example, the vehicle seat of claim 1 may be used in a commercial aircraft for in-flight entertainment. Airline companies have long sought ways of keeping passengers occupied during long flights. The vehicle seat of claim 1 provides a form of

entertainment for those passengers who don't travel with their notebooks or don't want to unpack their notebooks. Moreover, the vehicle seat of claim 1 makes it more convenient to edit images than a notebook, since the frame-mounted video monitor doesn't occupy a tray table or a passenger's lap.

The office action alleges that a laptop, programmed with image editing software and plugged into Brady's LRU, would produce a vehicle seat having all of the features of claim 1. We respectfully disagree. Such a laptop is not mounted to the seat frame.

Thus, the combined teachings of the cited documents do not produce a vehicle seat having all of the features of claim 1. For this additional reason, the '103 rejection of base claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-17 should be withdrawn.

The combined teachings of the cited documents do not produce an aircraft having all of the features of claim 18. For this additional reason, the '103 rejection of claims 18-20 should be withdrawn.

Brady doesn't teach or suggest the various types of entertainment that a passenger could enjoy with image editing software. Brady doesn't teach or suggest editing the passengers own digital images (claim 4), creating a digital travel log (claim 6), editing digital images taken by an externally-mounted aircraft camera (claim 8) or a seat-mounted camera (claim 10), or mixing personal images with content provided by the aircraft (claim 20). For these additional reasons, the '103 rejections of claims 4, 6, 8, 10 and 20 should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 has been amended to correct a typographical error. The examiner is thanked for pointing out the error.

The Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues before mailing another office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/

Hugh P. Gortler

Reg. No. 33,890

(949) 454-0898

Date: Jan. 28, 2009